



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/546,976	04/11/2000	Joon Suk Park	PIC-010.1P	4593

7590 08/29/2003

Rodger R. Wise  
Pillsbury Winthrop LLP  
725 South Figueroa Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406

EXAMINER

SCHULTZ, WILLIAM C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2664	

DATE MAILED: 08/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/546,976	PARK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	William C. Schultz	2664	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2000 .

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 4 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 April 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_ .

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_ .

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Drawings***

This application, filed under former 37 CFR 1.60, lacks formal drawings. The informal drawings filed in this application are acceptable for examination purposes. When the application is allowed, applicant will be required to submit new formal drawings.

Figure 1:

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters "10" and "68" have both been used to designate host computer or PC. Also, in the specification, on pg. 7 line 16, "... personal computer 10" and then on pg. 11 lines 24,26 the spec says, "host computer 68".

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters "52" and "66" have both been used to designate the PEU. Also, in the specification, on pg. 11, line 16, "... the PEU card 52" , then on line 20, "the PEU 66".

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because of the following minor informalities:

Pg. 1 of the specification says, "netphone's system is described in U.S. Patent 5,659,005" this is a polymer patent not a patent on pbx phone systems inside a computer. Applicant may want to correct this.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verthein et al. [U.S. Pat. 6,249,527] and further in view of Pounds et al. [U.S. Pat. 6,560,222].

Regarding claim 4, Verthein et al. discloses all the following subject matter: An apparatus comprising: one or more port expansion circuits having port interface circuits for coupling to one or more telephone lines at one or more ports; (**fig. 2**) a personal computer having a time division multiplexed switching circuit therein which is coupled to said one or more port expansion circuits by a packet switched bus and a time division multiplexed bus, (**fig. 2, parts 20,22**) said personal computer further comprising one or more programs for controlling said personal computer to use said packet switched bus and WAV channels each of which is comprised of a WAV port which are switched by a PBX program to couple to at least one Actual Port Object mapped to a particular telephone line to transport play data to the port interface circuit for said telephone line (**col. 3, line 60- col. 4, line1; col. 4, lines 15-20; col. 5, lines 53-64; col. 6, lines 19-**

**23 – WAV is disclosed as PCM, one skilled in the art would know that PCM is the encoding method for making the bits which comprise a WAV file; play data is interpreted as the digital call)**

Verthein et al. fails to disclose transport[ing] record data back from said port interface circuit to a voice recording application process.

Pounds et al. discloses a voice mail system. (col. 34, line 68 – col. 35, line 29)

It would have been obvious at the time of invention to modify Verthein et al. with Pounds so that client stations would not have to have the voice applications on their stations.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 1-3 are allowed.

Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William C. Schultz whose telephone number is 703-305-2367. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(7-4)(first bi-week) M-Th(7-4)(second bi-week).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on 703-305-4366. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

William Schultz

August 21, 2003



WELLINGTON CHIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600